

Remarks

The Office Action mailed May 10, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-29 and 32-47 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-29 and 32-47 stand rejected. Claims 30-31 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, 15-29, and 32-47 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The rejection of Claims 32-47 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully traversed. Claims 32-47 have been amended, and are submitted to be directed to statutory subject matter. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 101 rejection of Claims 32-47 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states on page 4 that in claims 15 and 26, it is unclear if “a parallel switchgear system” has already been made by the product configurator or is to be made by the product configurator. Applicants respectfully traverse the statement.

Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would understand Claims 15 and 26. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art, after reading the specification in light of the figures, would understand Claims 15 and 26. Specifically, the specification describes, for example, in paragraph 25, “Figure 3 is a process flow diagram of configurator system 60...To generate new quote 80, the user enters information required for a new quote 82 and a quote summary page 84 is generated and displayed for user information”. The specification, further describes, for example, in paragraph 26, “In addition to generating quote 108, configurator system 60 generates and displays a bill of material and engineering drawings. The engineering drawings include at least an equipment elevation drawing, an equipment outline drawing, and an electrical schematic.” The specification, further describes, for example, in paragraph 35, “In addition, the user can select up to twelve configurations for a frame size 286, an automatic transfer switch (ATS) 288, and a load block priority 290.” Accordingly, the specification describes, for example, that the user enters, within configurator system, information required for a new quote, that the configurator

system generates quote and engineering drawings including an electrical schematic, and that the user can select up to twelve configurations for a frame size. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15 and 26 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15 and 26 satisfy Section 112, second paragraph and respectfully request that the section 112 rejection of Claims 15 and 26 be withdrawn.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 6, 16-25, 27-29, 32, 35, and 39, and respectfully submit that Claims 1, 6, 16-25, 27-29, 32, 35, and 39 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 6, 16-25, 27-29, 32, 35, and 39 satisfy Section 112, second paragraph and respectfully request that the section 112 rejection of Claims 1, 6, 16-25, 27-29, 32, 35, and 39 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the section 112 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 7-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, Claims 33, 34, and 36-38 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 32, and Claims 40-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 39. When the recitations of Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants request that the rejection of Claims 2-5 and 7-14 under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn. When the recitations of Claims 33, 34, and 36-38 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 32, Applicants request that the rejection of Claims 33, 34, and 36-38 under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn. When the recitations of Claims 40-47 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 39, Applicants request that the rejection of Claims 40-47 under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 under 35 U.S.C. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the statement that “providing an automatic means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art in terms of patentability.” *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 93, 94 (CCPA 1958). “In Venner, however, all limitations in the claims,

including the automatic means, were disclosed in the applied references... In the present case, unlike in Venner, the examiner has not provided a reference which discloses a high speed rotary power tool, let alone one which is used for cleaning glass.” *Ex Parte Richard Brouillet, Jr.*, Appeal No. 1998-2297 (Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences). Applicants respectfully submit that, as explained below, the Office Action has not shown generation of an interface configured to receive an event message as recited in Claims 1, 6, 15, 26, 32, and 39.

Applicants admitted prior art describes that when a quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by a customer, an application engineer has to determine the customer’s requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote for the system (paragraph 3). After a purchase order for the paralleling switchgear system is received, the application engineer must manually complete “order entry” documents, which are used by a design engineer to custom design the system (paragraph 3). The design engineer reviews the specification, writes custom software for each paralleling switchgear system, and creates drawings and bills of material to manufacture the system (paragraph 3). At the completion of manufacturing, parameters necessary to configure the system are entered into various components manually one-by-one (paragraph 3). It would be desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order a paralleling switch gear system, develop a bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database (paragraph 7).

Claim 1 recites a method for using a computer network-based system including a server coupled to a centralized database and at least one client system, the method comprising the steps of “accessing a product configurator system; selecting switchgear product configurations related to a parallel switchgear system from a plurality of user interfaces; receiving a bill of material and a price quotation corresponding to the parallel switchgear system; automatically generating, via the product configurator system, an equipment elevation drawing and an electrical schematic of the parallel switchgear system based on information regarding the parallel switchgear system; and generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface configured to receive an event message annunciated by a light emitting diode (LED) annunciator based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input within the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface configured to receive an event message annunciated by a light emitting diode (LED) annunciator based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 2-5 and 7-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are also patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 6 recites a method for using a computer network-based system including a server coupled to a centralized database and at least one client system, the method comprising the steps of "accessing a product configurator system; selecting switchgear product configurations related to a parallel switchgear system from a plurality of user interfaces, wherein said step of selecting switchgear product configurations further comprises the steps of: using, by a user, a graphical user interface to select at least one of a system configuration, an engine generator configuration, and a distribution breaker configuration; using the client system to select various switchgear configurations through pull-down menus; wherein said step of selecting various switchgear configurations through pull-down menus comprises the step of using the pull-down menus to select a switchgear system configuration, wherein the switchgear system configuration comprises at least one of a system voltage, a number of generators, a size of generators, an enclosure, a laboratory tested listing, a short circuit rating,

a main bus size, and a main bus metering; and submitting the selections to the server; receiving a bill of material and a price quotation corresponding to the parallel switchgear system; automatically generating, via the product configurator system, an equipment elevation drawing and an electrical schematic of the parallel switchgear system based on information regarding the parallel switchgear system; and generating, via the product configurator system, an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 6. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer’s requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface as recited in Claim 6. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 15 recites a quotation system comprising “a parallel switchgear system; a device; a computer server connected to said device via a computer network and configured to receive user specifications and selected configurations; and a product configurator system configured to: receive user specifications and user selected configurations; generate a drawing and a quotation; receive, via a single graphical user interface, selections of multiple configurations for a size of an equipment of the parallel switchgear system; automatically generate an electrical schematic of the parallel switchgear system based on information regarding the parallel switchgear system; and generate an interface configured to receive an

event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 15. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer’s requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 16-25 and 27-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are also patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 26 recites a quotation system comprising “a parallel switchgear system; a device; a computer server connected to said device via a computer network and configured to receive user specifications and selected configurations; and a product configurator system configured to: receive user specifications and user selected configurations; generate a drawing and a quotation; receive, via a single graphical user interface, selections of multiple configurations for a size of an equipment of the parallel switchgear system, wherein said product configurator system further comprises a plurality of graphical user interfaces to configure at least one of a system, an engine-generator, and a distribution breaker, and said product configurator system user interface comprises a user interface to select at least one of a system voltage, a number of generators, a size of generators, an enclosure, a laboratory tested listing, a short circuit ratio, a main bus size, and a main bus metering; and generate an

interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 26. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer’s requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 32 recites a computer comprising “a record of parallel switchgear system configurations of a parallel switchgear system; a plurality of rules configured to match the record against customer submitted selections and configured to generate a particular configuration of the parallel switchgear system, wherein the rules are applied by the computer; and a record of results provided to a user via a graphical user interface from applying the matching rules to the customer submitted selections; selections, received via a single graphical user interface, of multiple configurations for a size of an equipment of the parallel switchgear system; an electrical schematic of the parallel switchgear system automatically generated based on information regarding the parallel switchgear system; and an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a computer as recited in Claim 32. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a computer including an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel

switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a computer including an interface as recited in Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 32 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 33-38 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 32. When the recitations of Claims 33-38 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 32, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 33-38 are also patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 39 recites a computer comprising “a code segment that receives user registration information from a user; a code segment that displays a graphic user interface to the user that selects a configuration of a parallel switchgear system; a code segment that receives selections from the user; a code segment that stores the selections into a centralized database; a code segment that cross-references the selections against a unique identifier; a code segment that provides a quotation if the unique identifier matches the selections; a code segment that generates an equipment elevation drawing and an electrical schematic drawing of the parallel switchgear system based on information regarding the parallel switchgear system, wherein said code segment that generates the equipment elevation drawing and the electrical schematic drawing is executed by the computer; and a code segment that generates an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system.”

Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a computer as recited in Claim 39. More specifically, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of

material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, Applicants admitted prior art does not describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface as recited in Claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 39 is patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 40-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 39. When the recitations of Claims 40-47 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 39, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 40-47 are also patentable over Applicants admitted prior art.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

In addition to the arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 is not a proper rejection. As is well established, the mere assertion that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Applicants admitted prior art to obtain the claimed recitations of the present invention does not support a *prima facie* obvious rejection. Rather, each allegation of what would have been an obvious matter of design choice must always be supported by citation to some reference work recognized as standard in the pertinent art and the Applicants given the opportunity to challenge the correctness of the assertion or the notoriety or repute of the cited reference. Applicants have not been provided with the citation to any reference supporting the combination made in the rejection. The rejection, therefore, fails to provide the Applicants with a fair opportunity to respond to the rejection, and fails to provide the Applicants with the opportunity to challenge the correctness of the rejection. Of course, such combinations are impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 under 35 U.S.C. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avery et al. (U.S. 2003/0208365 A1) in view of Applicants admitted prior art is respectfully traversed.

Applicants admitted prior art is described above.

Avery et al. describe a transformer ordering system framework that allows a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties (e.g., manufacturers, customers, vendors, designers, shippers, etc.) in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet (paragraph 81). All such efforts preferably define message formats that describe the business to be transacted (paragraph 81).

Claim 1 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface configured to receive an event message annunciated by a light emitting diode (LED) annunciator based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 2-5 and 7-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of

Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 6 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 6. More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface as recited in Claim 6. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 15 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 15. More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover,

Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 16-25 and 27-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 26 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 26. More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 32 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer as recited in Claim 32.

More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer including an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer including an interface as recited in Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 32 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 33-38 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 32. When the recitations of Claims 33-38 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 32, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 33-38 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claim 39 is recited above. Neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer program as recited in Claim 39. More specifically, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art describes determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover,

Applicants admitted prior art describes that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Accordingly, neither Avery et al. nor Applicants admitted prior art, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface as recited in Claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 39 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

Claims 40-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 39. When the recitations of Claims 40-47 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 39, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 40-47 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Applicants admitted prior art.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 under 35 U.S.C. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. (US Patent No. 6,633,799) and Nick (US Patent No. 6003012) is respectfully traversed.

Avery et al. is described above.

Krakovich et al. describe a configurable switchgear system. To ensure that the switchgear system operates in a proper mode and performs proper transfers or other switching operations for a given operational situation, the configurable switchgear system includes an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations (column 3, lines 34-40). The operator interface includes a port at which a plug-in card or cartridge storing the necessary information can be inserted (column 3, lines 40-42).

Nick describes a system in which customer needs were quantified and classified in terms of site specific needs, area specific needs, and general needs, to identify specific switchboard configurations that could satisfy the most frequent customer needs (column 2, lines 14-18). The more frequent and less complex configurations were grouped into standard configuration classes, and standardized with an understanding of the area-specific needs and

how components could be physically assembled to satisfy the customers' actual needs (column 2, lines 18-23).

Claim 1 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface configured to receive an event message annunciated by a light emitting diode (LED) annunciator based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, a graphical user interface as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claims 2-5 and 7-14 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-14 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claim 6 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for using a computer network-based system as recited in Claim 6. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by an input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator

interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest generating, via the product configurator system, an interface as recited in Claim 6. Therefore, Claim 6 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claim 15 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 15. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claims 16-25 and 27-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-25 and 27-29 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claim 26 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a quotation system as recited in Claim 26. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an

interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input within the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a product configurator system configured to generate an interface as recited in Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claim 32 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer as recited in Claim 32. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer including an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer including an interface as recited in Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 32 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claims 33-38 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 32. When the recitations of Claims 33-38 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 32, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 33-38 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claim 39 is recited above. None of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a computer program as recited in Claim 39. More specifically, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface configured to receive an event message annunciated based on an occurrence of an event sensed by a spare input of an engine generator of the parallel switchgear system. Rather, Avery et al. describe allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Krakovich et al. describe providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick describes grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Accordingly, none of Avery et al., Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a code segment that generates an interface as recited in Claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 39 is patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

Claims 40-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 39. When the recitations of Claims 40-47 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 39, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 40-47 are also patentable over Avery et al. in view of Krakovich et al. and Nick.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the Section 103 rejections of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 are not proper rejections. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Avery et al., Applicants admitted prior art, Krakovich et al., or Nick, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Avery et al. with Applicants admitted prior art, Krakovich et al., or Nick because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the cited art itself.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levingood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejections are based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patent application publications in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Avery et al. teach allowing a business-to-business e-commerce to be implemented by passing messages among parties in a loosely coupled network, such as an Intranet and the Internet. Applicants admitted prior art teaches determining, by an application engineer, a customer's requirements based on a specification, develop a bill of material, and a price quote when the quote for a paralleling switchgear system is requested by the customer. Moreover, Applicants admitted prior art teaches that it is desirable to have a network based method for a user to automatically configure and order the paralleling switch gear system, develop the bill of material, provide a price quotation, and store the configuration in a central database. Krakovich et al. teach providing an operator interface by which an operator must provide specific information to access and enable the proper mode and switching operations performed by a switchgear system. Nick teaches grouping more frequent and less complex configurations into standard configuration classes. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103 rejections appear to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible,

and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-29 and 32-47 be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of 1-29 and 32-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Patrick W. Rasche  
Registration No. 37,916  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070